5: Manning S-4 (no date) 1953 RD1 Ukraine RD1

assumed that it was equally binding in Ukraine and without any further ado, the Ukrainian peasants were given the right of selling any surplus products exactly as if there had been no independent Ukrainian Soviet government. 185 665

The legal aspects of this decree did not interest the bulk of the Ukrainian peasants. They saw only the relief which it afforded them and the opportunities that it gave. They immediately took advantage of it, and its first effects were to be seen in a surprisingly short time. Of course, there could be no improvement in the national well-being until the harvest and the harvest of 1921 was again reduced by drought, so that with the best of intentions, it was not until 1922 that conditions began to improve.

A new Russian land code was finally adopted on March 3, 1921, and it was, of course, the model to be observed in the Ukraine. Yet this did not suppress the discontent of the Ukrainian peasants. 423 671 ●

In an effort to suppress this smouldering discontent, D. Manuilsky, who was then the Commissar for Agriculture of the All-Ukrainian Revolutionary Committee (the revolutionary centre and the provisional government of the country), summoned to Kharkiv a gathering of agronomists from all parts of Ukraine in the First All-Ukrainian Agronomical Congress. He found the more than one thousand present practically united in their assertions that the agricultural laws as developed by the Bolsheviks were inapplicable to the Ukraine. They had been drawn up and approved on March 6, 1919 and they were entirely based on the spirit of the Russian land commune which provided usually for a redistribution of the land every three years, with the supplemental provision that the redistribution should take into account the number of persons in each family. This was all very good when it agreed, as it did in Russia, with the general spirit of the people who were vitally interested in the commune as such. Conditions were different in Ukraine and the purely artificial Land Society was developed. Of course, all the peasants had to become members but the land was divided by households rather than on an individual basis. Furthermore, it was provided in the Ukrainian Code that "The right to land handed over for labor use is without term and

433 can be taken away only in accordance with the provisions of the
● 671 law." This insured the individual household in possession of its own piece of land and made it possible for the more industrious to undertake the improvement of the soil.

By the time that the final form of the Labor Code was established on November 22, 1922, it had become almost essentially different from the Russian Code, although it paid a lip service to the principle of nationalization through the actions of the Land Societies. A further sign of submission was the establishment of maximums on landholding. No household in the densely settled areas could have more than fourteen hectares or, in the less thickly populated areas, forty-eight hectares. The Land Society had the right to decide on the form of exploitation of the land to be carried out but if a family disagreed with the form established, it was entitled to demand the same amount of land but not necessarily the same land that it had contributed. Furthermore, outside of the requirement that all members of household were compelled to labor personally on the land, the provisions dealing with hired labor and the renting of land were left purposely vague or were omitted for further study.

The new code, which was more liberal than that in Russia, was devised in the interests of the landless peasants and also the poor and middle peasants, and definitely ratified the seizure of the estates of the large landowners. Sixty-eight per cent of the landless peasants received small tracts of land and fifty-two percent of those with holdings from two to four hectares were settled under more favorable conditions, or received additional land. On the other hand, 27.2% of those with more than sixteen hectares, the normal holding, and 56.8% of those with more than twenty-five hectares, saw their additional land removed and handed over to their less fortunate neighbors. In a sense this might seem to have been a solution of the crying need of the peasants for land but it brought with it some unexpected results.

423 The civil war had completely destroyed any free capital, and
427 without capital the peasants could not buy the tools, the fertilizers, etc., which they needed to prosper. This made little difference in

9: Prothero G-4 (no date) 1920 RD1 Ukraine RD1

421 Governments have the smallest percentage of private ownership. Thus, in Kharkov, which contains the greatest number of Great Russians, only 35·8 per cent. of land is privately owned, and in Chernigov 41·7 per cent. The Poltava Government forms an exception; and, as it is a Government in which the Ukrainian population forms between 93 and 95 per cent., it is worth noticing that individual property still forms 45·1 per cent., even though the Stolypin reforms tended to give every facility for the introduction of communal ownership. But, though the Taurida, Kherson, and Yekaterinoslav Governments have the highest percentage of land individually owned, it is owned mostly by the nobles, especially in Yekaterinoslav (67·2 per cent.) and Kherson (63 per cent.), and less by the peasants (Yekaterinoslav, 23·7 per cent., and Kherson, 13·8 per cent.).

Taking into account both the individual and the communal land of the peasants, we find that only in the Governments of Kharkov (59 per cent.), Chernigov (53 per cent.), and Poltava (52 per cent.) do the peasants own above half of the arable land. In Volhynia, Podolia, and Kiev, they own between 40 and 48 per cent.; in Yekaterinoslav, 45 per cent.; while in Taurida and Kherson, where only about half the population is Ukrainian and town life is well developed, the percentage is 37.

The amount of land assigned to each family by the
[671] Emancipation Law of 1861 was between three and eight acres, though sixteen acres are necessary to support a family. Since then the population has increased by 43 per cent., but the land available for peasant owners has only increased by 20 per cent. (in 1910). This fact has compelled the peasants to rent land, and lies at the bottom of all economic unrest. In the Government of Poltava, where the situation is most acute, some 60 per cent. of the peasants own only from one to three *desyatines*[1] of land, and as few as 4 per cent. have more than five *desyatines*. In the Governments

[1] One *desyatine* = 2·7 acres.

10: Weinstein S-4 (no date) 1941 RD1 Ukraine RD1

under Tsarism, but a long road had to be travelled before all children would have an opportunity to attend schools. Buildings would have to be constructed, teachers trained, text-books written and published. The Ukrainian government first endeavored to provide "elementary" or four-year schools for all children from eight to twelve years of age, then to expand these schools into "incomplete middle" or seven-year schools, and finally to replace these with "complete middle" or ten-year schools; and, in the meanwhile, the government established technical schools and higher educational institutions to train engineers, doctors, actors and other types of "socialist cadres." This quantitative growth of the school system was matched by its growth qualitatively, as measured from the point of view of the language policy. In spite of the shortages of teachers knowing Ukrainian and the languages of the other minorities,[1] the almost complete absence of text-books in these languages, and the appearance of considerable opposition on the part of political leaders, of teachers and even of parents, the Russian language was gradually replaced as the medium of instruction by the other languages.

As early as March 1919 an order of the Commissariat of Education of the newly re-established Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic declared that the Russification policy was abrogated; that the Commissariat would aid in the development of the long-repressed Ukrainian language; and that "in view of the elimination of a governmental language as such, and of the declaration that all local languages are equal, the Commissariat of Education gives the local population the right to determine in which language teaching must be carried on in the schools, safeguarding simultaneously the interests of [other] national groups."[10] Wherever the language of instruction remained Russian, a second language — also chosen by the local population itself — was to be taught as a special subject. In September 1920 this provisional order was strengthened by a law of the Ukrainian Council of People's Commissars. The law instructed the Commissariat of Education to draw up a plan for schools of all grades and categories with Ukrainian as the language of instruction.[11] Ukrainian was to be studied as an obligatory subject in all teacher-training institutions and was to be used as the language of instruction in some of them. The law also ordered the Government Publishing House to issue "a sufficient quantity of text-books as well as *belles-lettres* and other publications in the Ukrainian language."

1921), pp. 3–6; *Zbirnik Uzakonen ta Rosporiadžen Robitničo-Seljanskogo Urjady Ukraini za 1924 rik*, 1924, part 1, sec. 271, pp. 800–803; Sojuz Robotnikov Prosveščenija S.S.S.R., *Pjatyssesojuznyi S'ezd Sojuza Robotnikov Prosveščenija S.S.S.R. Stenografičeski Otčet* (Moscow, 1925), pp. 172–174.

[10] *Zbirnik Uzakonen . . .*, 1919, sec. 260, p. 347.

[11] *Ibid.*, 1920, part 1, sec. 509, pp. 712–713.

1 [Prior To 1924 -- Analysis]